

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 20, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “the transport layer including multiple programs, data and information streams.” In applying Goodman the Examiner cites to column 4, lines 19-30 as allegedly teaching transmission of a transport layer. This section of Goodman teaches that the NIM 201 demodulates a selected one of the digitized program signals carried in a 6 Mhz channel. This selected one channel is then forwarded to the digital entertainment terminal. This is contrary to claim 1 which recites that the transport layer, including multiple programs, data and information streams, is transferred to a network input/output module, a decryption module, a demultiplexer and a decoder. Goodman does not teach that the entire transport layer is transmitted across these components, but rather one channel.

This is further evidenced by the operation of MPEG demultiplexer 827, which the Examiner relies upon as corresponding to the claimed network input/output module and demultiplexer. Goodman teaches that demultiplexer 827 recognizes audio/video packets of a **selected program** and routes those packets to decoders 829 and 831 (column 16, lines 53-60). Thus, the demultiplexer 827 does not route a transport layer, but rather a single selected program. Thus, Goodman does not teach processing of a transport layer as recited in claim 1.

This is further evidenced by Goodman’s description of the NIM 201. As applied by the Examiner, the NIM 201 sends information to the DET 202 over a network bus. The NIM 201, however, tunes to a single channel through tuner 901 as described in column 19, lines 19-63. Thus, Goodman only sends a single channel over the network bus coupling the NIM 201 and the DET 202.

Hylton was relied upon for disclosing a decryption module. Even if a decryption module was positioned in the DET 202 in Goodman, it would operate on a single channel, rather than a transport layer as recited in claim 1. Further, there is no motivation to add the decryption module of Hylton to the DET 202 of Goodman. Goodman already has a decryption module in the NIM 201 as shown as element 907 in Figure 9. It is unclear why a

decryption module would be needed in the DET 202 when it is already present in the NIM 201. Thus, there is insufficient motivation to combine Goodman and Hylton as proposed by the Examiner.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton. Claims 2-4 and 11 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claims 12, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Florin was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a system having a tuner and broadband input/output modules connected by a system bus. Florin, however, fails to cure the deficiencies of Goodman in view of Hylton discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claim 12 recites features similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 1 and is patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 12 and are patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 12.

Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Rajakarunanajake. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Rajakarunanajake was relied upon for allegedly disclosing features of a secured network conditional access system, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Goodman in view of Hylton discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claim 5-9 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Rajakarunanajake for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin and Rajakarunanajake. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Rajakarunanajake was relied upon for allegedly disclosing an Ethernet transport layer, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin discussed above with reference to claim 12. Claim 16 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over

Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin and Rajakarunanajake for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 12.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and D'Luna. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

D'Luna was relied upon for allegedly disclosing incorporating decrypting, demultiplexing and decoding functions on a single chip, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Goodman in view of Hylton discussed above with reference to claim 1. Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and D'Luna for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 1.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin and Lorenz. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Lorenz was relied upon for allegedly disclosing a decoder as part of a thin client set top box, but fails to cure the deficiencies of Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin discussed above with reference to claim 12. Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and is patentable over Goodman in view of Hylton and Florin and Lorenz for at least the reasons advanced with reference to claim 12.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 36192

Date: October 18, 2007